

REMARKS

The following comments are responsive to the Office Action of March 10, 2009 (“Advisory Action”). Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested based on the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-14, 16, 19-23, 25, and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0917355 A1 to Szucs et al. (hereafter referenced as Szucs) in view of U.S. Patent 6,401,242 B1 to Eyer et al. (hereafter referenced as Eyer). Claims 15, 17, 18, 26, 31-36, and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs in view of Eyer as applied to claims 1-14, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,671,219 to Jensen et al. (hereafter referenced as Jensen). Claims 24, 37, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs in view of Eyer as applied to claims 1-14, further in view of Jensen, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,965,770 B2 to Walsh, et al. (hereafter referenced as Walsh). Applicants respectfully traverse.

A. Comments on Claim 1

Applicants submit that the combination of Szucs and Eyer, even if proper, fails to teach or suggest “splitting the at least one service information table into sub-tables, wherein each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream” in combination with “establishing a mother table configured to maintain a sub-table of the certain transport stream and sub-tables of adjacent transport streams of the certain transport stream” in the manner recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request that the Office further explain with particularity what in the cited combination allegedly discloses the claimed “sub-table” and “mother table.” The Action concedes that Szucs fails to disclose these claim features (*see* Final Office Action dated November 28, 2008 (“Final Action”), p. 3-4), and relies on column 4, lines 31-37, column 4, lines 60-67, and column 6, lines 1-22 as allegedly discloses the claimed “sub-table” and “mother table.” *See* Advisory Action at p. 2 and Final Action at p. 3-4. Applicants respectfully submit the previously submitted arguments are valid, and respectfully request that the Office

further explain with particularity the Office's position of how Eyer allegedly discloses the claimed "sub-table" and "mother table."

Further, the Advisory Action equates the "sub-table identif[ying] a certain stream" with the region specific information and the "sub-tables of adjacent transport streams" with global information. *See* Advisory Action at p. 2 *citing* col. 5, ll. 60 - 67 of Eyer.

The region specific information and the global information differ from the claim 1, reciting that "each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream" in combination with "establishing a mother table configured to maintain . . . sub-tables of adjacent transport streams of the certain transport stream." In Eyer, the global and region specific information are both transmitted to the user. A difference between Eyer and claimed 1 is that global information is not only available in adjacent regions or cells, but in all cells including the region or cell where the region specific information is transmitted. Therefore, Eyer fails to teach or suggest "establishing a mother table configured to maintain . . . sub-tables of adjacent transport streams" and "wherein said adjacent transport streams comprise transport streams of at least one neighboring cell of said certain cell." As such, the combination of Szucs and Eyer, even if proper, fails to teach or suggest "splitting the at least one service information table into sub-tables, wherein each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream" in combination with "establishing a mother table configured to maintain a sub-table of the certain transport stream and sub-tables of adjacent transport streams of the certain transport stream" and "wherein said adjacent transport streams comprise transport streams of at least one neighboring cell of said certain cell" in the manner recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the combination cannot be used to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

B. Comments on Claims 2-41

Applicants submit that claims 2-41 are allowable for at least some of the reasons given in support of claim 1, in addition to the features they recite.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: April 24, 2009

By: /Christopher M. Swickhamer/
Christopher M. Swickhamer
Registration No. 59,853
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Fax: 312-463-5001